

CANDOUR

The British Views-Letter

Founded by A. K. Chesterton in 1953 to defend National Sovereignty against the menace of International Finance
Vol. XXXVI No. 1 Registered at the G.P.O. as a Newspaper January, 1985

THE PRICE OF POLITICAL UNION

by DOROTHY AUSTIN

(Secretary, Torbay Anti-Common Market League)

Our daily papers are full of the predicted eternal wrangling among our Continental competitors, but what is never mentioned is the "Draft Treaty for European Union". This Treaty was supposed to be the keynote of the Euro-election campaign, and yet all but one of the candidates with whom the Torbay Anti-Common Market League spoke had not even heard of it! Here, again, are just a few of the proposals contained in this document, which needs only two-thirds of the "Community's" voter's and parliaments to eradicate everything that this great country of ours has built up over a thousand years of valiant history, hard fought for and won at great cost in human sacrifice. Under European Union, our M.E.P.s will be forever in a tiny minority, unable in any way to protect the interests of Great Britain and her people.

Article 3 of this Draft Treaty states: "The citizens of the member states shall *ipso facto* be citizens of the Union . . . and be subject to its laws." Article 6: "It [the Union] may acquire or dispose of movable and immovable property." Article 7: "The Union shall take over the Community patrimony." Patrimony is a right or estate inherited from a father or from one's ancestors. Article 12: "Where this Treaty confers exclusive competence on the Union, the institutions of the Union shall have sole power to act; national authorities may only legislate to the extent laid down by the law of the Union." Article 13: "The [member-states] shall abstain from any measure which could jeopardise the attainment of the objectives of the Union." Article 42: "The law of the Union shall be directly applicable in the member states. It shall take precedence over national law." Article 52: "All the member states shall participate in the European monetary system."

There is more, much more, and in the reading of it one sees more clearly that it is identical to Communist constitutions, which is hardly surprising as the Draft Treaty is the brain-child of Communist Altiero Spinelli and other like-minded *rapporteurs*.

TRAITORS' GALLERY, No. 3

The M.E.P.s who voted for the Draft Treaty for European Union

Set out below are the names and addresses of the nineteen Members of the European Parliament who voted on February 14th of last year in favour of the Draft Treaty for European Union. We accuse them of Treason because the Treaty envisages setting up a supra-national political entity — the "Union of Europe" — with autonomous powers to achieve monetary, economic, political and fiscal union. It will be a sovereign body, acting in obedience to the E.E.C. Commission and its President, taking precedence over national laws.

We are publishing the M.E.P.s' addresses so that *Candour* readers, if they wish, may make direct and personal peaceful protests to the individuals concerned about their treasonable act in voting for the Draft Treaty. As the League of Empire Loyalists

proved, *only* when patriots bring it home to these people without remorse that it is *not* more comfortable and *not* more convenient to toe the internationalist line will they perhaps draw back from their insidious assaults on national sovereignty.

1. **P. Beazley** (Bedfordshire): "Rest Harrow", 14 The Combe, Rotton, Eastbourne BN20 9DB, Sussex.

2. **Miss N. F. Forster** (Birmingham South): 6 Regency House, Regency Street, London S.W.1.

3. **Sir James Scott-Hopkins** (Hereford and Worcester): 602 Nelson House, Dolphin Square, London S.W.1.

4. **D. Prag** (Hertfordshire): "Pine Hill", 47 New Road, Digswell, Hertfordshire AL6 0AG.

5. **C. Jackson** (Kent East): "Rock House", London Road, Maidstone, Kent.

6. **B. Patterson** (Kent West): 84 London Road, Tunbridge Wells, Kent TW1 1ED.

7. **T. E. Kellett Bowman** (Lancashire East): "Park Farm, Gressenhall, Norfolk and 33D Curzon Street, London W.1.

8. **F. A. Tuckman** (Leicester): 6 Cumberland Road, Barnes, London SW13 9LY.

9. **W. F. Newton-Dunn** (Lincolnshire): 6 Ugate, Louth, Lincolnshire LN11 9ET.

10. **Miss G. Hooper** (Liverpool): 11 Cleveland Row, London S.W.1.

11. **Sir Brandon Rhys Williams** (London South-East): 32 Rawlings Street, London S.W.3.

12. **J. de Courcy Ling** (Midlands Central): 31 Chapel Street, London S.W.1.

13. **P. Howell** (Norfolk): "Willys Croft", Church Road, Wrentham, Norfolk NR16 1BA.

14. **M. Gallagher** (Nottingham): 31 Woodhouse Road, Mansfield, Nottinghamshire.

15. **J. Provan** (Scotland North-East): Wallacetown, Bridge of Earn, Perth, Scotland.

16. **R. J. Moreland** (Staffordshire East): 17 Barnwood Road, Gloucester, Gloucestershire GL2 0R2.

17. **A. E. Turner** (Suffolk): 3 Montrose Place, London S.W.1.

18. **M. Seligman** (Sussex West): Micklepage House, Nuthurst, Horsham, Sussex.

19. **A. Hutton** (Scotland South): 7th Floor, 121 Vincent Street, Glasgow, Scotland G2 5HW.

PREPARING FOR EURO LAW?

A new form of juror's oath omitting any reference to the Queen came into force in courts in England and Wales on December 3rd. The words "I will faithfully try the several issues joined between our sovereign lady the Queen and the defendant" leave jurors confused, it is alleged by the Lord Chancellor's Department.

TREASON!

SAVE OUR COUNTRY FROM EUROPEAN SLAVERY

Alert the public to the fact that supporting
European Union is treason.

Send for our special poster.

Only £1 for 20 from
CANDOUR PUBLISHING COMPANY

CUT AND THRUST

The President of the Royal College of Obstetricians and Gynaecologists, writing in *The Times* last month with all the authority of his position, averred that a heavy responsibility rests on those who would ban the experimental use of the human embryo in the light of the major opportunities for research which such "human material" presents. Not so long after, a Harley Street doctor was seen in the same newspaper to object to the phrase "defenceless human embryos" as emotive — he preferred "blobs of cells" — justifying interference in pregnancy on the ground that we celebrate birthdays, not conception days!

Their use of the words "material" and "blobs" does rather suggest these supposedly learned medical practitioners have not the faintest idea what a human embryo is; hence their doubts that it deserves any kind of protection from laboratory use. The comments of the Harley Street savant, particularly, remind us of the late heretical theologian, Fr. Rahner, who published the biological fairy tale that human beings after conception go through stages of

animality; he even questioned whether babies are human at birth!

* * * *

With his usual lucidity, Lord Denning asked the key question about the nature and status of the embryo, when speaking in the Lords at the end of October:

"It is a thing? God forbid! It is not a thing . . . I would suggest that the only logical point at which the law could start is that the child, the human being, starts at the moment of conception and fertilisation . . . From that moment there is a living human being which is entitled to protection just as much as the law protects a child . . . If it (the law) does protect it in this way, it cannot be sold or bought, it cannot be destroyed, it cannot be experimented upon for research or the like."

There is really no doubt at all that the product of conception in any species, man included, is a small but genetically complete new member of that species, requiring only nurture in an hospitable environment

to bring it to maturity. That is why we believe that what the Warnock Report recommends is the licensing of deleterious and involuntary vivisection upon human subjects. It is impossible for those who deal daily with bottles of "blobs of cells" to treat them as anything other than that, and for this reason this Pandoras Box should be shut and locked. For in consigning the weakest and smallest of our fellow humans to be bred in laboratories and to live and die in the aid of experimentation, we would degrade also ourselves and our every claim to respect human dignity.

In so far as homosexuality is an inclination given to some people, and cannot easily be reversed, it is our compassion that these unfortunates need. However, whether they practise or not *is* in their hands, for homosexual temptations, like heterosexual ones, can be resisted and overcome. So it is with vexation that we view the "gay movement's" bold advance in recent years, demanding ever new "rights" and privileges, and immodestly proselytising by insisting not merely that homosexual temptation is natural but also that temptation must *not* be resisted. What these master-spirits demand is the "right" to do wrong.

The reality of the queers' lifestyle for which they claim acceptance by the rest of us can be seen from a report by Colin Welch in *The Spectator* on December 1st on the situation in the United States. The behaviour common among homosexuals — the pathological promiscuity, the random, repeated and anonymous sex, the group sex and anal-oral contacts — has led to a bushfire spread of grave or fatal diseases. Of active homos surveyed in the States, forty per cent reported known infection with gonorrhoea, thirteen per cent with syphilis. There are some 6,000 confirmed cases of AIDS in the U.S., reported Welch, "but it is estimated that five or ten times as many" are in an early *but infective* stage of the disease; and no cure is known.

Now, AIDS has spread to England. Some see in this virulent disease God's punishment of sin; worryingly, it is not only homosexuals who are struck down. The outbreak in southern England which infected more than forty people was started by a homo who was a regular blood donor. The disease will not become apparent in the poor unfortunates carrying his polluted blood for at least two years. It would indeed be no exaggeration to say that the "gay movement" threatens to become a reservoir of venereal disease which poses a menace to the entire community. Instead of seeking to build a "ministry" to homosexuals, our spiritual shepherds would be

better advised to return to a vigorous, clear and continual reaffirmation of the Church's traditional teaching on unnatural vice.

President Botha's concessions to Coloureds and Indians, and now the widespread rumours that his Government is preparing to hold direct talks with the banned African National Congress as part of an important new "peace" initiative, remind us of de Tocqueville's penetrating comments on the causes of the French Revolution in *L'Ancien Regime et la Revolution*:

"Experience teaches us that the most dangerous moment for a bad government is usually the one when it starts to introduce reforms. Only a great genius can save a Prince who attempts to relieve his subjects after a long period of oppression. The evils they endured patiently as if they were inevitable appear insufferable as soon as they conceive the possibility of escaping them. Thus the smallest vexations of Louis XVI seemed harder to bear than the depotism of Louis XIV."

De Tocqueville ignored, of course, the evidence that pointed to the French Revolution having been a most carefully prepared event by diabolists in whose hands the mob were mere pawns. Neither would we describe South Africa as "bad", "oppressive", "evil" or "insufferable". That said, the analysis applies admirably, *mutatis mutandis*, to the Nationalist Government's flabby liberal leadership and insidious promotion of multi-racialism, and should serve as a grim warning to Mr. Botha.

The possibility that the Government will means-test "child benefit" (isn't it a sign of the times that it is no longer called *family* allowance?) will place further pressure on the provident majority of the population to limit the number of children they have. For where once parenthood was a condition recognised through tax allowances applied without discrimination (these were only replaced by child benefit as a mechanism ensuring delivery to mothers), it now assumes a "welfare" status it never had before and if child benefit is means-tested will become a condition relative to income.

So the consequence of this philosophical drift will be to add to the insistent economic pressures against raising large families among the more skilful and robust middle-income couples marginally outside entitlement, since such people understandably believe it is better to bring up a couple of children in comfort and security than five or six on means woefully inadequate. However, complementary to this reduc-

tion in birthrate we are likely to see an explosion of low-income child-bearing, especially if benefits are enhanced by redistribution. What those who suggest such financial tinkering are saying is that middle-income taxpayers who already subsidise the poor through their taxes should derive no benefit from taxation themselves: that its purpose is redistributive and punitive, rather than designed for the general welfare. The Government should ponder more deeply the elements it is stirring.

* * * *

Three cheers for our wonderful Schools Inspectorate for producing a statement about the teaching of English which, twenty years ago, would have been taken for granted by anyone with an ounce of common sense. At the same time, a word of apology might have been in order to the generation of semi-literate youth which has been the victim of the philosophy that the teaching of grammar, spelling and punctuation does not matter so long as one is able to write "creatively".

* * * *

A local newspaper sent to us by a reader in London reported that a number of Chinese people had met to protest to their council that theirs was a "community" hitherto overlooked. The following week this splendid letter appeared from someone who felt himself part of another overlooked minority:

"I refer to those who are neither black nor gay, neither women nor disabled, neither Irish Republicans nor devotees of an Asiatic religion. I mean those of us who are heterosexual English Christian adult males who go to work in the week and to church on Sunday. Our community has done more for humanity over 19 centuries than any other, yet we are not even accepted as an organised minority with a voice of our own — discrimination in itself! We pay out for others, but get nothing in return. We are either taken for granted, or disparaged. We have a distinctive costume (trousers), racial characteristics (facial hair) and an ethnic language (modern Anglo-Saxon), but if any of us dares so much as to suggest organising together, we are laughed to scorn. The Council should at least sponsor a history book on the contribution of English non-black, non-Asian, non-lesbian man-persons to world civilisation as part of its on-going "multi-cultural education" initiatives."

Read **NATIONALISM TODAY**, edited by Joe Pearce. Sample copy 53p. from Nationalist Bookshop, 53 Pawsons Road, Croydon. Surrey CR0 2QF,

REPUTATIONS AT STAKE

Legislation empowering water authorities to add fluoride to their supplies was removed from the Queen's Speech after the Government received evidence from Japanese researchers indicating possible cancer risks. Ministers insisted, however, that they still believed fluoride to be safe and remained committed to introducing the legislation early in 1985.

So powerful and fiercely committed is the pro-fluoridation lobby that the history of this controversy shows that researchers sometimes claim that they have difficulty in drawing medical opinion to results which conflict with the conventional, establishment viewpoint. Dr. P. R. N. Sutton, a Research Fellow of Melbourne University, reveals in his book *Fluoridation 1979 — Scientific Criticisms and Fluoride Dangers* that the methods used to promote artificial fluoridation were mainly political — promotion by repressive action against those who questioned or opposed fluoridation. The tactics used were discouragement of scientific discussion and repression and abuse of scientists and others whose publications questioned fluoridation.

Professor Albert Schatz of Temple University — a dental researcher and co-discoverer of the anti-tuberculin drug streptomycin — said long ago: "Ever since U.S. dentistry created fluoridation, it has been forced to defend it in the face of world-wide opposition from many responsible dentists, physicians, physiologists, biochemists and others." Some are of Nobel Award status. As a result the reputation of U.S. dentistry, the U.S. public health service, the National Institute of Dental Research and now, no less, British dentistry, has become bound to the fate of fluoridation.

A stage has been reached where rejection of fluoridation would irreparably discredit all those prestigious individuals and august bodies who have so enthusiastically promoted it — mainly by endorsing each other's endorsements! Few, if any, have conducted their own research, preferring to base their opinions on existing American pro-fluoridation literature.

R. V. MUMMERY, L.D.S., R.C.S.

Editor's note. — According to a recent *Times* report, the Government has now introduced a Bill to empower water authorities in England, Wales and Scotland to add fluoride *without public approval*. This follows the rejection of the Japanese studies on the harm caused by fluoride, to which Mr. Mummery refers, by the "experts" of the Medical Research Council.

ANTI - RACIST 'RITHMETIC

by NOEL HUNT

A breathless press report brings us the exciting news that the Inner London Education Authority "has discovered that mathematics lessons can be pressed into service of the Authority's anti-racist drive". Heartening news, indeed, for those in the forefront of the battle against racism. Only a shirker like this writer would like to see racism defined and to know just why it is so bad. ILEA does not condescend to enlighten us. It is enough for us to know that ILEA is opposed to racism and to lend our tacit approval to their attempts to use mathematics to support a trendy and temporarily fashionable set of beliefs.

We are promised that "in will come problems about the relative earning power of black South African miners to whites . . ." No doubt the mental exercise involved in working at the problem and — surprise, surprise! — discovering that the white earns more than the black will be useful. Perhaps we, too, in our small way can do our bit to help things along by suggesting that, having arrived at an answer to the sum above, the pupil might be told to do a little research and so discover to what extent the housing of the black miner is subsidised from taxes paid by whites. With this knowledge at his disposal, the pupil can re-work his original sum. He may find that the black is not as heavily disadvantaged as the man of good will would have us believe.

A little more research will reveal the amount by which white taxes subsidise the educational costs of the black. Let little Rastus work his sum again taking account of this new information. It can only do him good, no matter what it does to the cherished beliefs of ILEA. But we can go further. Let the pupil now ascertain how much the white pays from his taxes to subsidise the costs of black hospital and health services. Armed with this information, he can once again re-work his sum. Finally, let our curly-headed little ethnic minority pupil and his guilt-ridden white fellow be directed to find out to what extent the travelling and transport costs of black miners are subsidised from white taxes paid by the brutal supporters of apartheid to assist the under-privileged and toiling black masses. (We trust that the clichés are right.)

Perhaps by now even the most dedicated of anti-racist pupils might welcome a change from arithmetic. So let us give them a set of suggested subjects for essays by way of a change. Here are a few which ILEA might find useful to teachers:

"Given that the costs of black housing, education, health and travel are all heavily subsidised by the white minority, would it not be unreasonable of the black to expect the same wages as a white? Write a short essay on this subject. Your answer should explain precisely why paying the black equal wages, whilst heavily subsidising his living expenses, would not, in fact, merely mean that he is given an unfair advantage over the white worker."

Another subject for an essay might be: "Given the black man's burning hatred of all types of racial discrimination, write an essay explaining in detail why blacks volunteer in thousands for employment in South African mines. Your answer should explain precisely why, with his hatred of discrimination, the black worker does not reject all white subsidies and insist on subjecting himself to the same stringent economic competition and taxation levels as the white."

It seems a pity to confine the anti-racist drive to mathematics. One could use it in the sphere of general knowledge, too. For example: "Name three black countries which tax their black nationals to raise money to make life easier for the white immigrants in their midst." If no such countries can be named, a further possibility of eradicating racial discrimination suggests itself. For instance: As a class project, draft a petition to the United Nations urging them to use their good offices to bring pressure to bear on the independent black states to tax their blacks to assist white immigrants as the South Africans tax whites to aid blacks. Alternatively, as a class project draw up a petition to the South African Government asking them in the name of equal treatment of all races to cease treating their black citizens as a favoured class.

We may be sure that class teachers and ILEA itself would be only too happy to give their blessing to these suggestions.

A. K. CHESTERTON ACADEMY

Candour subscribers who are interested are invited to write to us, enclosing an s.a.e., for details of our week-long "retreats" at Forest House in 1985, where you can enjoy mental sustenance by talking to like-minded people or just quietly read some of our many books in a secluded, rural atmosphere. The food is rather good, too!

A VISION FOR "THE LITTLE MAN"

by ANTHONY BEAMISH

The crimes of the cartels and the right of the "little man" are axiomatic to most readers of this journal. I would guess. However, we should always remember that many of the great cartels began as small businesses; indeed, it is one of the major curses of Capitalism that it does, and must, eliminate the small trader as it gathers up and absorbs into its monopoly the "luckier" small trader who can muscle in on the monopoly. The result is the public misfortune.

Part of the process lies in Capitalist competition depressing prices while Capitalist finance increases taxation and so forces *up* prices. The unfortunate trader is, therefore, squeezed between having to lower his prices to woo his neighbour's customers, and the burden of collecting ever increasing taxes to pay to the bailiffs in possession of municipal and national debt-finance. No wonder many traders are glad to sell up to escape this miserable dilemma, and submerge their worries in the cartel.

Are co-operatives the answer? Although I have great sympathy with the National Front's plans for re-structuring industry, particularly the retail trade, by transferring ownership from cartels to new workers' co-operatives, I am not so sure that the co-operative ownership movement *as it presently stands* possesses significantly greater social virtue than something like I.C.I. This is because all such concerns are run for money profit, paid to the shareholders. It is the public, buying the goods, who pay in prices the profits of the undertaking. I suppose this defect is to be expected: it comes of having to practise Capitalist methods because we live under the all-powerful money monopoly. But it is false thinking to suppose that we would be doing anything to remove the profit system by muscling in on the racket and setting up in capitalist competition with all the other big and little racketeers in the profit system.

Take the actual Co-operative concern as a case in point. The fact that the high street Co-op is, essentially, a *Capitalist* outfit forces it to cut (in real terms) its salaries and its costs in common with all the traders. It is forced to squander resources advertising. I do not doubt that it pays its directors handsome sums and its workers far less. Finally, it takes profit from its customers as all traders do, *and taking profit is the kernel of Capitalist finance*.

"Taking" is the operative word, incidentally, for it is absolutely untrue that anyone can "make" money

profit (except the banker, who literally creates money). The only people who *make* profit are those who make *things*, grow *things*, or perform services essential to the creation of such realities. We all seek to "make" money because we must, or endure perennial insecurity; and none of us realises that we are *not* making money, but *taking* it, from somebody else.

Thus, it is of no concern what high ideals may inspire today's small trader or good co-operator: *their* compulsion to extract money profit from the rest of us has the same effect, proportionately, as that of the great profiteering cartel. All that differs is the degree. Far from extracting a "reasonable" profit, they still raise prices and so prevent the total distribution of all possible production. Financially, economically and logically, the effect on society is the same.

"Highest Estate"

However, I would stress my argument it not intended to imply that co-operation *per se* is anti-social. The very opposite is true: to halt the natural monopolising tendency of Capitalism, producers' co-operatives (which the National Front's last election manifesto described as "the highest estate of private enterprise") are most desirable. What I believe is that there cannot be true co-operation *under the system of money-lending which now controls all enterprise*. It can be achieved only when every person is free to use his own initiative without the need to invest savings and collect money profit at the cost of his neighbour's enterprises. As I have explained above, the way things stand, co-operatives are under the same economic restraints as any other traders, having to cut costs (and costs are incomes), and to subjugate the human element under the great organising machine.

There can be no genuine private enterprise or co-operation in enterprise while the exchange tickets that we term "money" remain a usurers' monopoly — kept in short supply and only hired out at a rental to those who wish to use them. The nation's money must first be nationalised, the Crown having restored to it the right to issue money debt-free into the economy. After that, I do not think it will matter much if nothing else is nationalised — indeed, it will surprise our Left-wingers how few enterprises will need to be bureaucratically controlled. When an

individual with an urge to make something can obtain the finance free of interest, we shall all be the wealthier for the creation of things that will not need to pay a dividend, to show a profit (except in realities) or to be an "economic proposition". Yet until money is nationalised, little can be done that will "cost" more than can be recovered by the banks who now do the money making.

Here I think I should emphasise that my argument for the right of the individual to establish his supremacy over the immoralities of big business and the money-lending system does not imply a regression to the spinning wheel, the cutting off of all telephones or the abolition of electricity! I have a suspicion that this kind of plumb ignorance of Distributist ideas was what motivated a writer in last month's *Spearhead* to refer disparagingly to the National Front turning Britain "into a nation of enlightened peasants". What is demanded is a re-orientation of values in the public mind: an admission that economic systems be made to conform to the needs of men, and not men hammered into compliance with bad systems.

The system of mental distortion bearing the misnomer "education" has so warped our sense of true values that most people do not recognise how perverted is the conception which blindly accepts man must be trained and moulded to fit economic expedients. The deliberate stultification of the average worker, by machine-minding or pen-pushing, must be thrown aside. We have to return to sanity and insist that economic conditions be made to subserve the happiness and culture of man.

This is the essence of the case for the "little man". We have to set him free from servitude to machines; make the machines his servants. In our economic life we have to re-establish that quality of value inherent in any manufactured thing which gives expression to honest thought, high idealism and devotion to aesthetic fulfilment. For at present, just as mass-produced "convenience" food has corrupted our digestion and impaired our taste for real food, so has mass-produced furniture or houses deadened our appreciation of real handcrafts or joinery. In all this mass of machine-produced merchandise spewed off the conveyor belts, there is no sign of human skill, culture or appreciation.

If England can ever be merrier again, it will be when the thousands of poor human spinners who turn bolts on assembly lines or the thousands of poor girls who smack lids on an endless line of jam-jars are once again known by their callings. When a man is called Smith or Carpenter because he well and

truly is, and not only in the interests of "output", shall we have that "highest estate", a *real* co-operative community.

Antique Arguments

It will be of no consequence then if the "little man" shall choose to be, say, a little carpenter or a little shop-keeper among twenty others, for he would be performing a most valuable social service. It is the competition of Capitalist finance which seems to make so many carpenters or shop-keepers redundant, and it is characteristic of conventional economics that the immediate reaction to the evils of trade competition is to eliminate the human element *and not the financial evil* in the background. The impulse springs forward to preserve the evil and suppress the "redundant" human initiative, and is typical of all the shades of political thought today — Thatcherite, Alliance and Socialist.

The stock response of the advocates of rationalisation or nationalisation is to cry that we do not *need* twenty carpenters, etc. Why, on earth, not? The same antique argument runs that such proliferation raises prices. In an age of free credit, would this matter? We shall not need to cut costs, for costs are incomes. Indeed, in an age of free credit, the company director and the stock-broker will have no function and might well want to become carpenters! We shall certainly see the politician who currently talks so much of the "dignity of labour" allowing the labourer to enjoy the dignity of his calling, instead of endeavouring to cut the cost of him in the interests of cheaper output.

Two phenomena prevent the release of men and women from the purgatorial existence dictated by conventional economics. They lack the cultural and financial liberty to *choose* to do some other thing if they so will it because of (1) the deliberate wickedness of those who control a false financial system and their well-groomed stooges in Church and State, and sadly (2) the folly of the average person who does not understand that money is no more than paper. It is only in the utter defeat of this wickedness and folly that we shall see promoted the happiness of the "little man".

NEW CANDOUR SUBSCRIPTION RATES

U.K. £4.50

Overseas airmail £5.00

U.S.A. Dollar Rate \$10.00

Forest House, Liss Forest, Hants GU33 7DD

"CANDOUR" ACTION REPORT

by ANTHONY COONEY

HELP SAVE YOUR OWN SKINS

In *Liverpool Newsletter* recently, we proposed a new campaign for law enforcement by the effective punishment of criminals. We said that a number of attempts by lobbying of M.P.s, by petition, by electoral pledges, had all been shrugged off by the liberal establishment, entrenched, as elsewhere, in the Home Office. We went on to suggest that there might be one hope; namely, that the civil servants concerned with criminal policy simply did not know how terrible the situation is. If this is the case, we argued, we must find a way to make them aware. The immediately available way is to send cuttings from local 'papers; news-stories of the atrocities daily committed by an arrogant criminal element.

Confirmation of both the suggestion of real ignorance on the part of the policy-makers, and the effectiveness of a sustained press campaign in enlightening that ignorance, has suddenly come to us. For some two months past, the *Liverpool Echo*, a daily 'paper, has conducted a well-planned campaign to expose the extent of the drug trade on Merseyside, its evil results, and the necessity for draconian action on the part of the law-makers and the law-enforcers. Quite suddenly, the breakthrough came. The dossier compiled by the *Echo* went to the Director of Public Prosecutions. M.P.s hastened to scramble onto the bandwagon. Mrs. Thatcher, visiting Liverpool, was shewn the dossier. She was horrified at what it revealed. Her words were: "Pushers are the real enemies of our society — cold, callous, heartless." All four party conferences debated the question, and the Government was forced to announce to the Conservative Party Conference new measures, both preventive and deterrent, which included life sentences for the criminal organisers.

All credit, then, to the *Liverpool Echo*, which led the way and ensured that the Fleet Street 'papers would follow. However, how does that help us, for we do not have a daily 'paper with all its resources of trained investigative reporters, photographers, skilled interviewers and printing presses? The answer is: *we make one!* We let the commercial press do the work for us and publish the resulting news. We make sure that news reaches the people who matter. The people who, as a matter of status symbolism, only ever read *The Times* and *The Guardian* — newspapers for whom anything as sordid as crime reporting simply does not exist.

The process is simple. Each evening when you read your local 'paper, mark any particularly evil crime report — *no, you won't find it again next day if you don't mark it immediately* — and when the family have all read the 'paper, cut out the marked reports before going to bed. *No, you won't do it next day if you don't do it that night!* Paste the reports neatly onto sheets of white paper — "A4" 80gsm. paper is the best. By the end of the week, you will have accumulated five such pasted-up sheets. These will just come within the 60g./13p. postal rate. Fold them neatly and place in a long envelope and address to:

W. J. Bohan, Esq.,
Asst. Secretary of State,
Criminal Policy Dept.,
Home Office, —
50 Queen Anne's Gate,
London SW1H 9AT.

That is all there is to it, plus, of course, persistence; the willpower to do it every week for three months. If your local 'paper is a weekly, you could mail your cuttings once a fortnight. If you want to do a little more, you could write a covering letter asking that the contents be noted, registered, filed and acknowledged. The requirements of the campaign are not as simple as the process. For any hope of success, it is necessary that *every* reader takes part. We need people from all over the country sending crime reports each week to Mr. Bohan and his Department.

This is *not* a *Liverpool Newsletter* campaign. It is, indeed, not anyone's campaign. It is the spontaneous reaction of ordinary people all over the country to the crimes which destroy the Queen's Peace and the refusal of the Queen's servants to do anything about it. It just so happens that we are suggesting to readers how to be spontaneous. *Lets go!*

Exclusively available to subscribers

PORTRAIT REPRODUCTION OF A. K. CHESTERTON

Price: 50p.

CANDOUR PUBLISHING COMPANY
FOREST HOUSE, LISS FOREST, HANTS.

*Published by Candour Publishing Co. (Editor: R. de Bouneville), Forest House, Liss Forest, England and
Printed by Farnham Printing Co. Ltd.*

53, Greencroft Towers,
Felling, Gateshead 10.